LIBRARY
SUPREME COURT, U. S.

Office-Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
SEP 11 1969
JOHN F. DAVIS, CLERK

In the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1969.

No. 575.

JAMES R. SEWELL,

Petitioner,

vs.

STATE OF OHIO,

Respondent.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO.

RALPH RUDD,
33 Public Square Bldg.,
Cleveland, Ohio,
Attorney for Petitioner.

JERRY GORDON,
1732 Standard Bldg.,
Cleveland, Ohio,
Of Counsel.

THE GATES LEGAL PUBLISHING CO., CLEVELAND, OHIO—TEL. (216) 621-5647

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Opinions in the Courts Below ---------- 1

Jurisdiction ---------- 2

Questions Presented ---------- 2

The Constitutional and Statutory Provisions Involved 3

Statement of the Case ---------- 5

Reasons for Granting the Writ ---------- 11

I. The identification procedure used against petitioner was patently offensive to due process imperatives. Approval of that procedure by Ohio's state courts cannot be reconciled with relevant rulings by this Court ---------- 11

II. The question of whether an accused has a right under the due process and equal protection clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment to a preliminary examination once the examination had begun and before indictment by a Grand Jury warrants determination by this Court ---------- 13

III. The denial of petitioner's discovery motion raises important issues concerning the applicability of the Jencks rule to state proceedings and the extent to which a defendant may discover exculpatory material in possession of the state ---------- 15

Conclusion ---------- 16

Appendix:

Assignments of Error in Defendant's Brief Filed With the Court of Appeals of Ohio, Eighth Appellate District ---------- 17

Journal Entry of the Court of Appeals ---------- 18

Order of the Supreme Court of Ohio Dismissing Appeal ---------- 18

Order of the Supreme Court of Ohio Overruling Motion for Leave to Appeal ---------- 19

Mandate of the Supreme Court of Ohio ---------- 19

Transcript of Proceedings, Defendant's Preliminary Examination, Cleveland Heights Municipal Court, July 11, 1966 ---------- 19

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.

Cases.

Brady v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 83 (1963) ---------- 15

Cox v. Louisiana, 379 U.S. 536 (1965) ---------- 14

Douglas v. Alabama, 380 U.S. 415 (1965) ---------- 14

Foster v. California, ---- U.S. ---- 89 S. Ct. 1127 (1969) ----------10, 12

Giles v. Maryland, 386 U.S. 66 (1968) ---------- 15

Griffin v. Illinois, 351 U.S. 12 (1956) ---------- 14

Harrison v. U.S., 392 U.S. 219 (1968) ---------- 13

Jencks v. United States, 353 U.S. 657 (1957) ---------- 15

Palmer v. Peyton, 359 F.2d 199 (C.A. 4th Cir. 1966) 12

Pointer v. Texas, 380 U.S. 400 (1965) ---------- 14

Rogers v. Richmond, 365 U.S. 534 (1961) ---------- 16

Ross v. Sirica, 380 F.2d 557 (D.C. Cir. 1967) ---------- 13

State v. White, 15 Ohio St. 2d 146, 239 N.E.2d 65 ---- 15

State v. Wilkinson, 17 Ohio St. 2d 9, 244 N.E.2d 480 (1969) ---------- 13

Stovall v. Denno, 388 U.S. 293 (1967) ---------- 11

Wheeler v. Flood, 269 F. Supp. 194 (D.C. E.D. N.Y. 1967) ---------- 13

Constitution and Statutes.

Constitution of the United States:

Fourteenth Amendment 3, 10, 13, 14, 15

Ohio Revised Code:

Sec. 2907.081 ..... 3, 5

Sec. 2937.10 ..... 4, 13

Sec. 2937.11 ..... 4, 14

28 U.S.C. 1257(3) 2

In the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1969.

No. _____.

JAMES R. SEWELL,

Petitioner,

vs.

STATE OF OHIO,

Respondent.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO.

The petitioner, James R. Sewell, asks that a Writ of Certiorari issue to review the judgment of the Supreme Court of Ohio, made and entered on May 21, 1969 (App. p. 18) denying petitioner's motions for appeal of right and for leave to appeal. A motion for reconsideration was denied on June 18, 1969 (App. p. 18). The consequence of the denial of these motions was the affirmance of the judgment of the Ohio Court of Appeals which had sustained the conviction of this petitioner who had been found guilty by a jury and sentenced in the Court of Common Pleas for Cuyahoga County, Ohio.

OPINIONS IN THE COURTS BELOW.

Neither the Court of Common Pleas of Cuyahoga County, the Court of Appeals for the Eighth Appellate District of Ohio nor the Supreme Court of Ohio wrote an opinion in this case. The relevant entries from each court are reproduced in Appendix pp. 18-19.